

## REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 21 December 2001 with nineteen claims, two of which were written in independent form. Claims 10-19 have been canceled without prejudice. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 6 and 20 have been amended.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the term “said corresponding portion.” Claim 6 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,153,379 to Guzik *et al.* (“Guzik”). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner stated, “Guzik teaches (fig. 1) a substrate for a device package comprising: ... the intermediate metallization (portion 114 that is covering 124) in a first corner region extending beyond the second portion (102) to uniquely identify the first corner region.”

The Examiner has failed to point out any teaching in Guzik that would show, teach, or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, “intermediate metalization layer in said first corner region extending beyond said second portion to uniquely identify said first corner region” as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). It appears from Figure 1 of Guzik that all four corners of the device of Guzik have the similar metallization (114) extending beyond the second portion (104), as shown in Figures 3a, 3b, and 4a of Guzik.

The Examiner stated, “amended claims 1 and 20 recite the limitation that the intermediate metallization layer in the first corner region extending beyond the second portion to uniquely identify the first corner region. However the claim does not preclude the four from being the same.” The Examiner offers no support for this interpretation of unique.

Webster’s II New Riverside Dictionary defines unique as “1. Being the only one 2. Being without equal” and provides incomparable, matchless, peerless, unequalled, unparalleled, and unrivaled as synonyms. Thus, the language of Claim 1 clearly does not support the Examiner’s interpretation of the claim.

As Guzik does not support the rejection of Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Guzik is defective and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Guzik. The

applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 3-9 depend from and further limit Claim 1. As presented above with respect to Claim 1, Guzik does not anticipate Claim 1, much less the limitations of Claim 1 in addition to the further limitations of Claims 3-9. Therefore, the rejections of Claims 3-9 as anticipated by Guzik are defective and should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Guzik. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner stated, "Guzuk teaches (fig. 1) a substrate for a device package comprising: ... the second portion not covering the first corner region such that the first corner region is uniquely identified."

The Examiner has failed to point out any teaching in Guzak that would show, teach, or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, "said second portion not covering said first said corner region such that said first corner region is uniquely identified" as recited by Claim 20 (emphasis added). It appears from Figure 1 of Guzik that all four corners of the device of Guzik have the similar metallization (114) extending beyond the second portion (104), as shown in Figures 3a, 3b, and 4a of Guzik.

As Guzik does not support the rejection of Claim 20, the rejection of Claim 20 as anticipated by Guzik is defective and should be withdrawn.

Claims 21-24 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Guzik. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 21-24 and 26-28 depend from and further limit Claim 20. As presented above with respect to Claim 20, Guzik does not anticipate Claim 20, much less the limitations of Claim 20 in addition to the further limitations of Claims 21-24 and 26-28. Therefore, the rejections of Claims 21-24 and 26-28 as anticipated by Guzik are defective and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,037,698 to Ueda *et al.* ("Ueda"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner stated, "Ueda teaches (fig. 15) a substrate for a device package comprising: a first portion (5) of a package having a first surface (upper surface of 5) the first surface having a plurality of corner regions (the four corners of 5); an intermediate metallization

layer (portion 16 that is covering 5) on the first surface of the first portion (upper surface of 5), the intermediate metallization layer extending into a first corner region (53); a second portion (6) of the package on the first surface (upper surface of 5) of the first portion (5), the intermediate metallization (16) in the first corner region (22a) extending beyond the second portion (6) to uniquely identify the first corner region.”

The applicant respectfully submits that Ueda does not show, teach, or suggest “said intermediate metalization layer in said first corner region extending beyond said second portion to uniquely identify said first corner region.”

The substrate body (5) of Ueda’s device has notches (22a-22d) formed in each corner of the substrate body (5). The substrate body (6) likewise has notches (34a-34d) formed in each corner of the substrate body (6).

As shown in Figures 2A, 2B, 5A, 5B, 12, 14, and 19 of Ueda, the corner regions of the first substrate body (5) do not appear to extend beyond the second substrate body (6). As a result, the intermediate metallization layer in the first corner region cannot extend beyond the second portion to uniquely identify the first corner region as required by Claim 1.

As Ueda does not support the rejection of Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Ueda is defective and should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 2 depends from and further limits Claim 1. As presented above with respect to Claim 1, Ueda does not anticipate Claim 1, much less the limitations of Claim 1 in addition to the further limitations of Claim 2. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 2 as anticipated by Ueda is defective and should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner stated, “Ueda teaches (fig. 15) a substrate for a device package comprising: a first portion (5) of a package having a first surface (upper surface of 5) the first surface having a plurality of corner regions (the four corners of 5); an intermediate metallization layer (16) on the first surface (upper surface of 5) of the first portion (5) extending into a first

corner region (22a); a second portion (6) of the package supported by the first surface of the first portion (5), the second portion not covering the first corner region such that the first corner region is uniquely identified (fig. 15).”

The applicant respectfully submits that Ueda does not show, teach, or suggest “a first portion of a package having a first surface, said first surface having a plurality of corner regions” and “said second portion not covering said first said corner region such that said first corner region is uniquely identified” as recited by Claim 20.

The substrate body (5) of Ueda’s device has notches (22a-22d) formed in each corner of the substrate body (5). These notches are shown in 2A, 2B, 4, 5A, 5B, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, and 21 with various metallization patterns formed over the substrate body (5). The substrate body (6) likewise has notches (34a-34d) formed in each corner of the substrate body (6).

As shown in Figures 2A, 2B, 5A, 5B, 12, 14, and 19 of Ueda, the corner regions of the first substrate body (5) do not appear to extend beyond the second substrate body (6). As a result, Ueda does not appear to show, teach, or suggest “said second portion not covering said first said corner region such that said first corner region is uniquely identified” as required by Claim 20.

As Ueda does not support the rejection of Claim 20, the rejection of Claim 20 as anticipated by Ueda is defective and should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 25 depends from and further limits Claim 20. As presented above with respect to Claim 20, Ueda does not anticipate Claim 20, much less the limitations of Claim 20 in addition to the further limitations of Claim 25. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 25 as anticipated by Ueda is defective and should be withdrawn.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles A. Brill/  
Charles A. Brill  
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4379  
FAX: (972) 917-4418